

The zeros of the derivative of the Riemann zeta function near the critical line

Haseo Ki

Department of Mathematics, Yonsei University, Seoul 120–749, Korea

haseoyonsei.ac.kr

February 2, 2008

Abstract

We study the horizontal distribution of zeros of $\zeta'(s)$ which are denoted as $\rho' = \beta' + i\gamma'$. We assume the Riemann hypothesis which implies $\beta' \geq 1/2$ for any non-real zero ρ' , equality being possible only at a multiple zero of $\zeta(s)$. In this paper we prove that $\liminf (\beta' - 1/2) \log \gamma' \neq 0$ if and only if for any $c > 0$ and $s = \sigma + it$ with $|\sigma - 1/2| < c/\log t$ ($t \geq 10$)

$$\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) = \frac{1}{s - \rho} + O(\log t),$$

where $\rho = 1/2 + i\gamma$ is the closest zero of $\zeta(s)$ to s and the origin. We also show that if $\liminf (\beta' - 1/2) \log \gamma' \neq 0$, then for any $c > 0$ and $s = \sigma + it$ ($t \geq 10$), we have

$$\log \zeta(s) = O\left(\frac{(\log t)^{2-2\sigma}}{\log \log t}\right)$$

uniformly for $1/2 + c/\log t \leq \sigma \leq \sigma_1 < 1$.

1 Introduction

The Riemann hypothesis (RH) states that the real part of any nonreal zero of the Riemann zeta function $\zeta(s)$ is $1/2$. A. Speiser [13] has a theorem which says that RH is equivalent to the nonexistence of nonreal zeros of $\zeta'(s)$ in $\operatorname{Re}(s) < 1/2$.

We let $\rho' = \beta' + i\gamma'$ denote a zero of $\zeta'(s)$ where a sum over ρ' is repeated according to multiplicity. N. Levinson and H. L. Montgomery [8] proved that for nonreal zeros of $\zeta'(s)$ the average value of β' with $0 < \gamma' \leq T$ is $1/2 + \log \log T / \log T$. But it is likely that $\beta' - 1/2$ is usually of the order $1/\log T$ rather than $\log \log T / \log T$.

By a result of B. C. Berndt [1], the number of zeros with ordinate less than T is

$$\sum_{0 < \gamma' \leq T} 1 = \frac{T}{2\pi} \log \frac{T}{4\pi e} + O(\log T).$$

Under RH, K. Soundararajan [12] demonstrated the presence of a positive proportion of zeros of $\zeta'(s)$ in the region $\sigma < 1/2 + \nu/\log T$ for all $\nu \geq 2.6$. ‘A positive proportion of zeros’ means

$$\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\frac{T}{2\pi} \log T} \#\{\rho' : \beta' \leq 1/2 + \nu/\log T, 0 < \gamma' \leq T\} > 0.$$

In his remarkable work, Y. Zhang [15] showed that not only unconditionally there exists a $\nu > 0$ such that a positive proportion of zeros of $\zeta'(s)$ are in the region $|\sigma - 1/2| < \nu/\log T$, but also assuming RH and a strong hypothesis of the distribution of zeros of $\zeta(s)$, ν can be arbitrary small. Recently, Feng [5] proved the Zhang’s second theorem only assuming the strong hypothesis. Thus it is very probable that

$$\liminf (\beta' - 1/2) \log \gamma' = 0.$$

Assuming the truth of RH, K. Soundararajan [12] conjectured that the following two statements are equivalent:

- (i) $\liminf (\beta' - 1/2) \log \gamma' = 0$;
- (ii) $\liminf (\gamma^+ - \gamma) \log \gamma = 0$ where γ^+ is the least ordinate of a zero of $\zeta(s)$ with $\gamma^+ > \gamma$.

Y. Zhang [15] has shown that (ii) implies (i) as follows.

Theorem A. *Assume RH. Let α_1 and α_2 be positive constants satisfying $\alpha_1 < 2\pi$ and*

$$\alpha_2 > \alpha_1 \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\alpha_1}{2\pi}}\right)^{-1}.$$

If $\rho = 1/2 + i\gamma$ is a zero of $\zeta(s)$ such that γ is sufficiently large and $\gamma^+ - \gamma < \alpha_1(\log \gamma)^{-1}$, then there exists a zero ρ' of $\zeta'(s)$ such that

$$|\rho' - \rho| < \alpha_2(\log \gamma)^{-1}.$$

In this paper, we consider the converse of Theorem A. Namely is it true that (i) implies (ii)? Concerning this problem, we have the following.

Theorem 1. Assume RH. Then the following are equivalent:

- (1) $\liminf(\beta' - 1/2) \log \gamma' \neq 0$;
- (2) For any $c > 0$ and $s = \sigma + it$ with $|\sigma - 1/2| < c/\log t$ ($t \geq 10$)

$$\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) = \frac{1}{s - \rho} + O(\log t),$$

where $\rho = 1/2 + i\gamma$ is the closest zero of $\zeta(s)$ to s and the origin;

Corollary 1. Assume RH and $\liminf(\beta' - 1/2) \log \gamma' \neq 0$. Then, for any $c > 0$ and $s = \sigma + it$ ($t \geq 10$), we have

$$\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) = O((\log t)^{2-2\sigma})$$

uniformly for $1/2 + c/\log t \leq \sigma \leq \sigma_1 < 1$.

Based on our theorems and Soundararajan's conjecture, we speculate as follows.

Conjecture. Assume RH. Then the following are equivalent:

- (i)' For any $c > 0$ and $s = \sigma + it$ ($t \geq 10$), we have

$$\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) = O((\log t)^{2-2\sigma})$$

uniformly for $1/2 + c/\log t \leq \sigma \leq \sigma_1 < 1$;

- (ii)' The negation of (ii), i.e., $\liminf(\gamma^+ - \gamma) \log \gamma \neq 0$.

We briefly introduce why (2) in Theorem 1 doesn't seem possible. We let $s = \sigma + it$ for real numbers, σ, t . It is known in [3, p. 99] and [14, Theorem 9.6(A)] that for $t \geq 10$ and $-1 \leq \sigma \leq 2$ we have

$$\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) = \sum_{|\gamma-t| \leq 1} \frac{1}{s - \rho} + O(\log t), \quad (1.1)$$

where the sum is over the ordinates of the complex zeros $\rho = \beta + i\gamma$ of $\zeta(s)$. However, assuming RH, we may expect a stronger result. Under RH we have

$$\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) = \sum_{|\gamma-t| \leq 1/\log \log t} \frac{1}{s - \rho} + O(\log t) \quad (1.2)$$

for $t \geq 10$. For this we refer to [14, p. 357 (14.15.2)]. According to the formula (1.2), we can see that the formula (2) in Theorem 1 is very unrealistic, because ' $|\sigma - 1/2| < c/\log t$ ' in (2) doesn't seem probable instead of ' $|\gamma - t| \leq 1/\log \log t$ ' in (1.2).

Concerning Corollary 1, it is worth noting that under RH

$$\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) = O((\log t)^{2-2\sigma}) \quad (1.3)$$

holds uniformly for $1/2 + c/\log \log t \leq \sigma \leq \sigma_1 < 1$, where $t \geq 10$, $c > 0$ and ‘ O ’ depends upon c and σ_1 . For the proof of it, we apply the fact [14, (14.14.5)] to the formula

$$\frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|s-z|=\frac{c}{2\log \log t}} \frac{\log \zeta(z)}{(s-z)^2} dz.$$

Then we immediately get (1.3). In proving (1.3), one cannot relax the condition ‘ $1/2 + c/\log \log t$ ’ as

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{c}{\log t} \quad (t \rightarrow \infty).$$

With this information, it is very likely that on $\operatorname{Re}(s) = 1/2 + c/\log t$ ($t \geq 10$),

$$\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) \neq O(\log t).$$

On the other hand, Corollary 1 follows from a Phragmén-Lindelöf argument, provided that we have

$$\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) = O(\log t)$$

on $\operatorname{Re}(s) = 1/2 + c/\log t$ ($t \geq 10$). Thus we find the behavior of the logarithmic derivative of the Riemann zeta function near $\operatorname{Re}(s) = 1/2$ subtle and so we need a deep observation about the Riemann zeta function near the critical line to establish $\liminf(\beta' - 1/2) \log \gamma' = 0$. In fact we will see from Theorem 4 in Section 2 that the behavior of $\zeta'(s)/\zeta(s)$ on $\operatorname{Re}(s) = 1/2 + c/\log t$ is very much related to

$$\sum_{0 < |\gamma - \tilde{\gamma}| < 1} \frac{1}{\gamma - \tilde{\gamma}},$$

where $1/2 + i\gamma, 1/2 + i\tilde{\gamma}$ are complex zeros of $\zeta(s)$ and the sum is over $\tilde{\gamma}$.

From Corollary 1, we can demonstrate the following.

Corollary 2. *Assume RH and $\liminf(\beta' - 1/2) \log \gamma' \neq 0$. Then, For any $c > 0$ and $s = \sigma + it$ ($t \geq 10$), we have*

$$\log \zeta(s) = O\left(\frac{(\log t)^{2-2\sigma}}{\log \log t}\right)$$

uniformly for $1/2 + c/\log t \leq \sigma \leq \sigma_1 < 1$.

Assuming RH, it is known in [14, p. 355 (14.14.5)] and [14, Theorem 14.14(B)] that for any $c > 0$ and $s = \sigma + it$ ($t \geq 10$), we have

$$\log \zeta(s) = O\left(\frac{(\log t)^{2-2\sigma}}{\log \log t}\right) \quad (1.4)$$

holds uniformly for $1/2 + c/\log \log t \leq \sigma \leq \sigma_1 < 1$, and there exists an absolute constant $c^* > 0$ depending on c such that

$$-c^* \frac{\log t}{\log \log t} \log\left(\frac{2}{(\sigma - \frac{1}{2}) \log \log t}\right) < \log |\zeta(s)| < c^* \frac{\log t}{\log \log t} \quad (1.5)$$

holds for $1/2 < \sigma \leq 1/2 + c/\log \log t$;

$$\arg \zeta(s) = O\left(\frac{\log t}{\log \log t}\right) \quad (1.6)$$

holds uniformly for $1/2 \leq \sigma \leq 1/2 + c/\log \log t$. However, as in the proof of (1.3), one cannot relax the condition ' $1/2 + c/\log \log t$ ' of (1.4) as $1/2 + c/\log t$ ($t \rightarrow \infty$). On the other hand, we have Ω -theorems related to $\log \zeta(s)$ near the critical line. For these, we refer to Montgomery's results [10] and [14, p. 209]. In particular, Montgomery showed that assuming RH, for $1/2 \leq \sigma < 1$ and any real θ , there is a t with $T^{1/6} \leq t \leq T$ such that

$$\operatorname{Re} (e^{-i\theta} \log \zeta(s)) \geq \frac{1}{20} (\log T)^{1-\sigma} (\log \log T)^{-\sigma}.$$

See [10, p. 512]. Recently, from random matrix theory, in the case that $\theta = 0$ in the above Ω -result, it is conjectured in [4] that we have the following:

$$\max_{t \in [0, T]} \left| \zeta\left(\frac{1}{2} + it\right) \right| = \exp\left((1 + o(1)) \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log T \log \log T}\right).$$

Concerning negative values of $\log |\zeta(s)|$, we observe that by (1.5) and (1.6), it is possible that we have

$$\left| \log \zeta\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\log t} + it\right) \right| > \psi(t) \frac{\log t}{\log \log t}$$

for some arbitrarily large values of t , where $\psi(t) \rightarrow \infty$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$. A sharp Ω -result like this implies $\liminf (\beta' - 1/2) \log \gamma' = 0$. Namely, we note that it will follow if we show that (1.4) does not hold uniformly for $1/2 + 1/\log t \leq \sigma \leq 1/2 + 1/\log \log t$. Thus, Corollary 2 is useful in investigating the horizontal behavior of zeros of the derivative of the Riemann zeta function.

We apply our theorem to mean values of the logarithmic derivative of the Riemann zeta function:

$$\int_0^T \left| \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(\sigma + it) \right|^2 dt$$

for $\sigma = 1/2 + a/\log T$.

We may get the following from a result of A. Selberg [11, equation (1.2)].

Theorem B. Assume RH. Then

$$\int_0^T \left| \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(\sigma + it) \right|^2 dt \sim \frac{1}{4a^2} T \log^2 T$$

holds where $\sigma = 1/2 + a/\log T$ and $a \rightarrow \infty$, $a = o(\log T)$.

We introduce more studies on mean values of the logarithmic derivative of $\zeta(s)$. Following Montgomery [9], let

$$F(\alpha, T) = \frac{1}{\frac{T}{2\pi} \log T} \sum_{0 < \gamma, \tilde{\gamma} \leq T} T^{i\alpha(\gamma - \tilde{\gamma})} w(\gamma - \tilde{\gamma}),$$

where $\beta + i\gamma$ and $\tilde{\beta} + i\tilde{\gamma}$ are zeros of $\zeta(s)$ and $w(u) = \frac{4}{4+u^2}$. Montgomery conjectured that for any fixed $A > 1$,

$$(MH) \quad F(\alpha, T) \sim 1 \quad \text{uniformly for } 1 \leq \alpha \leq A.$$

Under RH, D. A. Goldston, S. M. Gonek and H. L. Montgomery [7] considered

$$\int_0^T \left| \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(\sigma + it) \right|^2 dt$$

for $\sigma = 1/2 + a/\log T$ as $a \rightarrow 0$ and proved the following, provided that (MH) is valid.

Theorem C. Assume RH and (MH). Then

$$\int_0^T \left| \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(\sigma + it) \right|^2 dt \sim \frac{1}{2a} T \log^2 T$$

holds where $\sigma = 1/2 + a/\log T$ and $a = a(T) \rightarrow 0$ (sufficiently slowly) as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

We have the following as in Theorem 1.

Theorem 2. Assume RH and $\liminf(\beta' - 1/2) \log \gamma' \neq 0$. Then

$$\int_0^T \left| \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(\sigma + it) \right|^2 dt = \frac{1}{2a} T \log^2 T \left(1 - \frac{\log(2\pi e)}{\log T} + O\left(a \log \frac{1}{a}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right) \right)$$

holds where $\sigma = 1/2 + a/\log T$ and $a \rightarrow 0$. Here ‘O’ doesn’t depend upon a and T .

(MH) implies Montgomery’s pair correlation conjecture. That is,

$$\sum_{\substack{0 < \gamma, \tilde{\gamma} \leq T \\ 0 < \gamma - \tilde{\gamma} \leq 2\pi\beta/\log T}} 1 \sim \frac{T}{2\pi} \log T \int_0^\beta 1 - \left(\frac{\sin \pi u}{\pi u} \right)^2 du.$$

Clearly (MH) implies

$$\liminf(\gamma^+ - \gamma) \log \gamma = 0.$$

Assuming RH, Theorem A says that

$$\liminf(\beta' - 1/2) \log \gamma' \neq 0 \text{ implies } \liminf(\gamma^+ - \gamma) \log \gamma \neq 0.$$

Thus the assumptions of Theorem C and Theorem 2 are contradictory to each other. However, we have the similar conclusion in Theorem C and Theorem 2. Further, a theorem of D. A. Goldston, S. M. Gonek and H. L. Montgomery [7, Theorem 3] says the following.

Theorem D. *Assume RH. Then, for $\sigma = 1/2 + a/\log T$ and any fixed $a > 0$,*

$$\int_0^T \left| \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(\sigma + it) \right|^2 dt \sim \frac{1 - e^{-2a}}{4a^2} T \log^2 T$$

holds as $T \rightarrow \infty$ if and only if the pair correlation conjecture is true.

Combining Theorem B and Theorem 2, we immediately have the following.

Theorem 3. *Assume RH and $\liminf(\beta' - 1/2) \log \gamma' \neq 0$. Then, for $\sigma = 1/2 + a/\log T$,*

$$\int_0^T \left| \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(\sigma + it) \right|^2 dt \sim \frac{1 - e^{-2a}}{4a^2} T \log^2 T$$

holds where $a \rightarrow 0$ or $a \rightarrow \infty$ and $a = o(\log T)$.

Apparently, Theorem D and Theorem 3 are similar. However the conclusion of Theorem D says a much stronger statement than that of Theorem 3. We notice that the pair correlation conjecture implies $\liminf(\beta' - 1/2) \log \gamma' = 0$. Thus the conclusion of Theorem 3 under $\liminf(\beta' - 1/2) \log \gamma' \neq 0$ is instructive to understand the behavior of the mean value of the logarithmic derivative of the Riemann zeta function.

2 Proof of Theorem 1 and Corollaries 1, 2

We arrange the zeros of the Riemann zeta function $\zeta(s)$ on the upper half-plane as $\rho_1, \rho_2, \dots$ with $\rho_n = \beta_n + i\gamma_n$ and

$$0 < \gamma_1 \leq \gamma_2 \leq \dots,$$

where it appears precisely m times consecutively in the above sequence, if a zero is multiple with multiplicity m . RH is that $\beta_n = 1/2$ for any $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$

We state basic facts.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $T > 0$. Then, we have:*

(1) *The number of zeros of $\zeta(s)$ in $0 < \text{Im}(s) \leq T$ is*

$$\sum_{1 < \gamma_n \leq T} 1 = \frac{T}{2\pi} \log \frac{T}{2\pi e} + O(\log T);$$

(2) *The number of zeros of $\zeta(s)$ in $T \leq \text{Im}(s) \leq T + 1$ is $O(\log T)$.*

For Proposition 2.1(1), see [3, p. 98] and [14, Theorem 9.4]. Proposition 2.1(2) immediately follows from (1).

We start with the following theorem.

Theorem 4. *Assume RH and $\liminf(\gamma_{n+1} - \gamma_n) \log \gamma_n > 0$. Then the following three statements are equivalent:*

(A) $\liminf(\beta' - 1/2) \log \gamma' > 0$;

(B) *Let $c > 0$ and $s = \sigma + it$. For sufficiently large n , we have*

$$\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) = \frac{1}{s - \rho_n} + O(\log t),$$

where $\frac{\gamma_{n-1} + \gamma_n}{2} < t \leq \frac{\gamma_{n+1} + \gamma_n}{2}$ and $|\sigma - 1/2| < c / \log \gamma_n$;

(C) $\limsup |M_n| / \log \gamma_n < \infty$, where

$$M_n = \sum_{0 < |\gamma_m - \gamma_n| \leq 1} \frac{1}{\gamma_n - \gamma_m}.$$

Proof of Theorem 4. We may assume that all but finitely many nontrivial zeros of $\zeta(s)$ are simple and on $\text{Re}(s) = 1/2$, because we assume RH and $\liminf(\gamma_{n+1} - \gamma_n) \log \gamma_n > 0$.

(C) $\Rightarrow$ (B). We recall that

$$\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) = O(\log t) + \sum_{|\gamma - t| \leq 1} \frac{1}{s - \rho}$$

for $-1 \leq \text{Re}(s) \leq 2$ and $t \geq 2$.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\delta > 0$. Suppose that $\liminf(\gamma_{n+1} - \gamma_n) \log \gamma_n > \delta$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{m \neq n} \frac{1}{(\gamma_n - \gamma_m)^2} = O\left(\frac{\log^2 \gamma_n}{\delta^2}\right)$$

for sufficiently large n .

Proof of Proposition 2.2. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m \neq n} \frac{1}{(\gamma_m - \gamma_n)^2} &= \sum_{|\gamma_m - \gamma_n| > 1} \frac{1}{(\gamma_m - \gamma_n)^2} + \sum_{0 < |\gamma_m - \gamma_n| \leq 1} \frac{1}{(\gamma_m - \gamma_n)^2} \\ &= I + II. \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

By Proposition 2.1(2), the number of γ_n 's between t and $t + 1$ is $O(\log t)$ for $t > 1$. Then, for some $C > 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\gamma_n + k < \gamma_m \leq \gamma_n + k + 1} \frac{1}{(\gamma_m - \gamma_n)^2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\gamma_n - k - 1 \leq \gamma_m < \gamma_n - k} \frac{1}{(\gamma_m - \gamma_n)^2} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{C \log(\gamma_n + k)}{k^2} + \sum_{\gamma_n - k > 1} \frac{C \log(\gamma_n - k)}{k^2} \\ &\leq C \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\log \gamma_n + \log k}{k^2} + C \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\log \gamma_n}{k^2} = O(\log \gamma_n) \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

By the assumption of Proposition 2.2, there exists a positive integer n_1 such that

$$\gamma_{m+1} - \gamma_m \geq \frac{\delta}{\log \gamma_m} \quad \text{for all } m \geq n_1.$$

Using this, for sufficiently large n , we have

$$|\gamma_{n+k} - \gamma_n| \geq \frac{|k|\delta}{\log(\gamma_n + 1)} \geq \frac{|k|\delta}{2 \log \gamma_n}$$

for $|\gamma_{n+k} - \gamma_n| \leq 1$ and $|k| \geq 1$. Here there exists a $a > 0$ such that $1 \leq |k| \leq a \log \gamma_n$. Thus we get

$$II \leq \sum_{1 \leq |k| \leq a \log \gamma_n} \frac{1}{\left(\frac{k\delta}{2 \log \gamma_n}\right)^2} < \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{2}{\left(\frac{k\delta}{2 \log \gamma_n}\right)^2} = O\left(\frac{\log^2 \gamma_n}{\delta^2}\right).$$

We apply this inequality and (2.2) to (2.1) and then we obtain

$$\sum_{m \neq n} \frac{1}{(\gamma_m - \gamma_n)^2} = O\left(\frac{\log^2 \gamma_n}{\delta^2}\right)$$

for sufficiently large n . This proves Proposition 2.2. $\square$

Proposition 2.3. Choose $c_1 > 0$ such that $\liminf(\gamma_{n+1} - \gamma_n) \log \gamma_n > 2c_1$. Define $M_n(t)$ by

$$M_n(t) = \sum_{0 < |\gamma_m - \gamma_n| \leq 1} \frac{1}{t - \gamma_m}$$

for $\gamma_{n-1} + c_1/\log \gamma_n \leq t \leq \gamma_{n+1} - c_1/\log \gamma_n$. Then we have

$$M_n(t) = O(\log t),$$

where the implied constant is absolute.

Proof of Proposition 2.3. Since

$$M'_n(t) = \sum_{0 < |\gamma_m - \gamma_n| < 1} \frac{-1}{(t - \gamma_m)^2} < 0,$$

$M_n(t)$ is decreasing. Thus it suffices to consider the endpoints for the proof. By Proposition 2.2 and our assumption (C), we have

$$\begin{aligned} M_n \left(\gamma_{n+1} - \frac{c_1}{\log \gamma_n} \right) &= \sum_{0 < |\gamma_m - \gamma_n| \leq 1} \frac{1}{\gamma_{n+1} - \gamma_m - \frac{c_1}{\log \gamma_n}} \\ &= \sum_{0 < |\gamma_m - \gamma_{n+1}| \leq 1} \frac{1}{\gamma_{n+1} - \gamma_m - \frac{c_1}{\log \gamma_n}} + O(\log \gamma_n) \\ &= \sum_{0 < |\gamma_m - \gamma_{n+1}| \leq 1} \frac{1}{\gamma_{n+1} - \gamma_m - \frac{c_1}{\log \gamma_n}} - \frac{1}{\gamma_{n+1} - \gamma_m} + \\ &\quad M_{n+1} + O(\log \gamma_n) \\ &= O \left(\frac{1}{\log \gamma_n} \sum_{0 < |\gamma_m - \gamma_{n+1}| < 1} \frac{1}{(\gamma_{n+1} - \gamma_m)^2} \right) + O(\log \gamma_{n+1}) \\ &= O(\log \gamma_n). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$M_n \left(\gamma_{n-1} + \frac{c_1}{\log \gamma_n} \right) = O(\log \gamma_n).$$

Proposition 2.3 follows. $\square$

Using Proposition 2.1(2), Proposition 2.3 and (C), for $\rho_n = 1/2 + i\gamma_n$ and $s = \sigma + it$ ($t \geq 10$), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) &= \frac{1}{s - \rho_n} + \sum_{\substack{\rho \neq \rho_n \\ 0 < |\gamma - t| \leq 1}} \frac{1}{s - \rho} + O(\log t) \\ &= \frac{1}{s - \rho_n} + \sum_{0 < |\gamma_m - \gamma_n| \leq 1} \frac{1}{s - \rho_m} + \sum_{\substack{|\gamma_m - \gamma_n| > 1 \\ 0 < |\gamma_m - t| \leq 1}} \frac{1}{s - \rho_m} + O(\log t) \\ &= \frac{1}{s - \rho_n} + \sum_{0 < |\gamma_m - \gamma_n| \leq 1} \frac{1}{s - \rho_m} + O \left(\sum_{0 < |\gamma - t| \leq 1} 1 \right) + O(\log t) \\ &= \frac{1}{s - \rho_n} + \sum_{0 < |\gamma_m - \gamma_n| \leq 1} \frac{1}{s - \rho_m} - \frac{1}{i(t - \gamma_m)} + \frac{M_n(t)}{i} + O(\log t) \\ &= \frac{1}{s - \rho_n} + O \left(\sum_{m \neq n} \frac{\sigma - \frac{1}{2}}{(\gamma_m - \gamma_n)^2} \right) + O(\log t) \end{aligned}$$

in $|\sigma - 1/2| < c/\log \gamma_n$. By this and Proposition 2.2, (B) follows.

(B) $\Rightarrow$ (A). We need the following proposition for this.

Proposition 2.4. *Assume RH and $\liminf(\gamma_{n+1} - \gamma_n) \log \gamma_n > 0$. Let $\tilde{\delta}$ be such that $0 < \tilde{\delta} < \delta$ where δ is as in Proposition 2.2. Suppose $\zeta'(\beta' + i\gamma') = 0$ for sufficiently large γ' . If $|\gamma' - \gamma_n| \geq \tilde{\delta}/(2 \log \gamma')$ for all n , then we have*

$$\frac{1}{2} \log \gamma' + O(1) = O\left(\left(\beta' - \frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{\log^2 \gamma'}{\tilde{\delta}^2}\right).$$

Proof of Proposition 2.4. We set

$$\xi(s) = \frac{s(s-1)}{2} \pi^{-s/2} \Gamma(s/2) \zeta(s)$$

for any $s \in \mathbb{C}$. It is known that for some constants A and B ,

$$\xi(s) = e^{A+Bs} \prod_{\rho} \left(1 - \frac{s}{\rho}\right) e^{\frac{s}{\rho}},$$

where ρ runs through all zeros of $\xi(s)$. See [3, p. 80] and [14, p. 30] for this. We note that any zero ρ of $\xi(s)$ is either $1/2 + i\gamma_n$ or $1/2 - i\gamma_n$ for some n , provided that RH is true. By the product formula of $\xi(s)$, we get

$$\frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)} = \frac{1}{2} \log \pi - \frac{1}{s-1} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Gamma'(\frac{s}{2} + 1)}{\Gamma(\frac{s}{2} + 1)} + B + \sum_{\rho} \frac{1}{s-\rho} + \frac{1}{\rho}.$$

Then we have

$$\operatorname{Re} \frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)} = \frac{1}{2} \log \pi - \operatorname{Re} \frac{1}{s-1} - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Re} \frac{\Gamma'(\frac{s}{2} + 1)}{\Gamma(\frac{s}{2} + 1)} + \sum_{\rho} \operatorname{Re} \frac{1}{s-\rho}. \quad (2.3)$$

We assumed that for any n ,

$$|\gamma_n - \gamma'| > \frac{\tilde{\delta}}{2 \log \gamma'}. \quad (2.4)$$

By (2.3) we obtain that for $s = \beta' + i\gamma'$, we get

$$\sum_{\rho} \operatorname{Re} \frac{1}{s-\rho} = -\frac{1}{2} \log \pi + \operatorname{Re} \frac{1}{s-1} + \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Re} \frac{\Gamma'(\frac{s}{2} + 1)}{\Gamma(\frac{s}{2} + 1)}. \quad (2.5)$$

Applying the standard fact [3, p. 73]

$$\frac{\Gamma'(s)}{\Gamma(s)} = \log s + O\left(\frac{1}{|s|}\right), \quad (|\arg(s) - \pi| > \theta > 0)$$

to (2.5), we obtain

$$\sum_{\rho} \operatorname{Re} \frac{1}{s - \rho} = \frac{1}{2} \log t + O(1). \quad (2.6)$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\rho} \operatorname{Re} \frac{1}{s - \rho} &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\beta' - \frac{1}{2}}{(\beta' - \frac{1}{2})^2 + (\gamma' - \gamma_n)^2} + \frac{\beta' - \frac{1}{2}}{(\beta' - \frac{1}{2})^2 + (\gamma' + \gamma_n)^2} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\beta' - \frac{1}{2}}{(\beta' - \frac{1}{2})^2 + (\gamma' - \gamma_n)^2} + O\left(\beta' - \frac{1}{2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by this and (2.6), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2} \log \gamma' + O(1) = O\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\beta' - \frac{1}{2}}{(\gamma' - \gamma_n)^2}\right). \quad (2.7)$$

Using (2.4) and Proposition 2.2, we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\beta' - \frac{1}{2}}{(\gamma' - \gamma_n)^2} = O\left(\left(\beta' - \frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{(\log \gamma')^2}{\tilde{\delta}^2}\right).$$

We insert this to (2.7) and then we get

$$\frac{1}{2} \log \gamma' + O(1) = O\left(\left(\beta' - \frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{(\log \gamma')^2}{\tilde{\delta}^2}\right).$$

This proves Proposition 2.4. $\square$

Suppose

$$\liminf(\beta' - 1/2) \log \gamma' = 0.$$

Then this and Proposition 2.4 implies that we have sequences $\langle \epsilon_k \rangle$, $\langle \rho_{n_k} \rangle$ and $\langle \rho'_k \rangle$ such that

$$\rho_{n_k} = 1/2 + i\gamma_{n_k}, \zeta'(\rho'_k) = 0, |\rho'_k - \rho_{n_k}| < \frac{\epsilon_k}{\log \gamma_{n_k}} \text{ and } \epsilon_k \rightarrow 0 \text{ } (\epsilon_k > 0). \quad (2.8)$$

Using (B), we get

$$\frac{1}{\rho'_k - \rho_{n_k}} + O(\log \gamma_{n_k}) = 0.$$

Thus we obtain that for some $c_1 > 0$,

$$|\rho'_k - \rho_{n_k}| > \frac{c_1}{\log \gamma_{n_k}}.$$

Note that c_1 doesn't depend on ϵ_k 's. By this and (2.8), we obtain

$$\frac{\epsilon_k}{\log \gamma_{n_k}} > \frac{c_1}{\log \gamma_{n_k}}.$$

But this is a contradiction, since $\epsilon_k \rightarrow 0$ and $c_1 > 0$ is a fixed real number. Thus (A) follows.

(A) $\Rightarrow$ (C). Suppose

$$\limsup \frac{|M_n|}{\log \gamma_n} = \infty.$$

We write

$$\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) = O(\log \gamma_n) + \frac{1}{s - \rho_n} + \sum_{0 < |\gamma_m - \gamma_n| \leq 1} \frac{1}{s - \rho_m}$$

for $|s - \rho_n| \leq \epsilon / \log \gamma_n$. Let ϵ be an arbitrarily small positive real. As in the proof of (C) $\Rightarrow$ (B), using Proposition 2.2, we obtain

$$\sum_{0 < |\gamma_m - \gamma_n| \leq 1} \frac{1}{s - \rho_m} - \frac{M_n}{i} = O(\log \gamma_n)$$

on $|s - \rho_n| \leq \epsilon / \log \gamma_n$. Then we can see that on $|s - \rho_n| = \epsilon / \log \gamma_n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| (s - \rho_n) \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) - (s - \rho_n) \sum_{0 < |\gamma_m - \gamma_n| \leq 1} \frac{1}{s - \rho_m} \right| &< \frac{\epsilon}{\log \gamma_n} (M_n + O(\log \gamma_n)) \\ &= \left| (s - \rho_n) \sum_{0 < |\gamma_m - \gamma_n| \leq 1} \frac{1}{s - \rho_m} \right| \end{aligned}$$

for infinitely many n 's. We note that

$$(s - \rho_n) \sum_{0 < |\gamma_m - \gamma_n| \leq 1} \frac{1}{(s - \rho_m)}$$

has a zero at $s = \rho_n$. Thus Rouché's theorem implies that for some s' in $|s - \rho_n| < \epsilon / \log \gamma_n$,

$$(s' - \rho_n) \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s') = 0,$$

i.e., $\zeta'(s') = 0$. Therefore $\liminf(\beta' - 1/2) \log \gamma' = 0$. Hence (A) implies (C). We have completed the proof of Theorem 4. $\square$

Now we prove Theorem 1 and Corollaries 1, 2.

Proof of Theorem 1. Assume that

$$\liminf(\beta' - 1/2) \log \gamma' \neq 0.$$

Then RH implies that $\liminf(\beta' - 1/2) \log \gamma'$ is positive. Then, by Theorem A, we obtain $\liminf(\gamma_{n+1} - \gamma_n) \log \gamma_n > 0$. Thus, by Theorem 4, we have (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2).

Assume (2) is true. If there exist multiple zeros for $\zeta(s)$, we immediately get a contradiction from (2). Thus all zeros of $\zeta(s)$ are simple. Suppose that

$$\liminf(\gamma_{n+1} - \gamma_n) \log \gamma_n = 0.$$

Then there exists a sequence of natural numbers $\langle n_k \rangle$ with $n_k < n_{k+1}$ such that

$$(\gamma_{n_{k+1}} - \gamma_{n_k}) \log \gamma_{n_k} \rightarrow 0$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$. Using (2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) &= \frac{1}{s - \rho_{n_{k+1}}} + O(\log t) \\ &= \frac{1}{s - \rho_{n_k}} + O(\log t) \end{aligned}$$

at $s = 1/2 + i(\gamma_{n_{k+1}} + \gamma_{n_k})/2$. By this, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{s - \rho_{n_{k+1}}} - \frac{1}{s - \rho_{n_k}} = O(\log \gamma_{n_k})$$

or

$$\frac{1}{\gamma_{n_{k+1}} - \gamma_{n_k}} = O(\log \gamma_{n_k}).$$

Namely, we have

$$\frac{1}{(\gamma_{n_{k+1}} - \gamma_{n_k}) \log \gamma_{n_k}} = O(1).$$

This is a contradiction, for $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (\gamma_{n_{k+1}} - \gamma_{n_k}) \log \gamma_{n_k} = 0$. Hence, by Theorem 4, we have (2) $\Rightarrow$ (1).

Thus Theorem 1 follows. □

Proof of Corollary 1. Assume (1). We fix $c > 0$. Then, by Theorem 4 (B), we have

$$\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) = O(\log(|t| + 3)) \quad (2.9)$$

on $\sigma = 1/2 + c/\log(|t| + 3)$. Using this, it is not hard to see that Corollary 1 follows from a Phragmén-Lindelöf argument. We give the detailed proof for convenience. For the following version of the Phragmén-Lindelöf Theorem, we refer to [2, p. 138].

Phragmén-Lindelöf Theorem. *Let G be a simply connected region and let f be an analytic function on G . Suppose there is an analytic function $\varphi : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ which never vanishes and is bounded on G . If M is a constant and $\partial_\infty G = A \cup B$ such that*

$$(a) \text{ for every } a \text{ in } A, \limsup_{s \rightarrow a} |f(s)| \leq M;$$

$$(b) \text{ for every } b \text{ in } B, \text{ and } \eta > 0, \limsup_{s \rightarrow b} |f(s)| |\varphi(s)|^\eta \leq M;$$

then $|f(s)| \leq M$ for all s in G .

Here $\partial_\infty G = \partial G =$ the boundary of G if G is bounded, $\partial_\infty G = \partial G \cup \{\infty\}$ if G is unbounded and the limit superior of $f(s)$ as $s \rightarrow a$, is defined by

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow a} |f(s)| = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \sup\{|f(s)| : s \in G \cap B(a, r)\},$$

where $B(a, r) = \{s \in \mathbb{C} : |s - a| < r\}$. If $a = \infty$, $B(a, r)$ is the ball in the metric of $\mathbb{C}_\infty = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\}$.

We apply this theorem for proving (1) $\Rightarrow$ (3). We define sets G_1 and G_2 by

$$G_1 = \{s \in \mathbb{C} : \sigma \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{c}{\log(|t| + 3)}\} \text{ and } G_2 = \{s \in \mathbb{C} : 0 \leq \sigma \leq 1 + c, |t| \leq 1\}.$$

We define G by

$$G = G_1 \cap (\mathbb{C} - G_2).$$

We note that $1 \notin G$. We define $f(s)$ by

$$f(s) = \frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s) \log s}$$

for $s \in G$. Then, $f(s)$ is analytic on the region G . We choose $\varphi(s) = \exp(-\sqrt{s})$. Clearly, the function $\varphi : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is an analytic function which never vanishes and is bounded on G . By (2.9), there exists $M > 0$ such that we have

$$|f(s)| \leq M \tag{2.10}$$

on the boundary ∂G .

Claim. We have

$$\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) = O(\log^2(|t| + 3))$$

for $s = \sigma + it \in G$.

Proof of Claim. We may suppose $\sigma < 2$ and $t \geq 10$. Using Proposition 2.1(2), (1.1) and the fact that $|\sigma - 1/2| > c/\log(|t| + 3)$ for $s \in G$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) &= \sum_{|t-\gamma|<1} \frac{1}{s-\rho} + O(\log t) \\ &= O\left(\log t \sum_{|t-\gamma|<1} 1\right) + O(\log t) \\ &= O(\log^2 t). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, Claim follows. □

Let $\eta > 0$. Then, by Claim, we conclude that in G , we have

$$\limsup_{s \rightarrow \infty} |f(s)| |\varphi(s)|^\eta = O \left(\limsup_{r \rightarrow \infty} \log r \exp \left(-\eta \sqrt{r} \cos \frac{\pi}{4} \right) \right) = 0.$$

With this and (2.10), we see that the functions f and φ fulfill the conditions of Phragmén-Lindelöf Theorem. Hence $|f(s)| \leq M$ for $s \in G$. Namely, we obtain

$$\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) = O(\log |s|)$$

for $s \in G$. In particular, we have

$$\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) = O(\log t)$$

uniformly for $1/2 + c/\log t \leq \sigma \leq 1/2 + c/\log \log t$ ($t \geq 10$). From this, (1.3) and the fact that for $1/2 + c/\log t \leq \sigma \leq 1/2 + c/\log \log t$,

$$(\log t)^{2-2\sigma} = O(\log t),$$

we prove Corollary 1. □

Proof of Corollary 2. Using (1.4) and Corollary 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log \zeta(s) &= \log \zeta(\sigma_1 + it) - \int_{\sigma}^{\sigma_1} \frac{\zeta'(\tilde{\sigma} + it)}{\zeta(\tilde{\sigma} + it)} d\tilde{\sigma} \\ &= O \left(\frac{(\log t)^{2-2\sigma_1}}{\log \log t} \right) + O \left(\int_{\sigma}^{\sigma_1} (\log t)^{2-2\tilde{\sigma}} d\tilde{\sigma} \right) \\ &= O \left(\frac{(\log t)^{2-2\sigma_1}}{\log \log t} \right) + O \left(\frac{(\log t)^{2-2\sigma}}{\log \log t} \right) \\ &= O \left(\frac{(\log t)^{2-2\sigma}}{\log \log t} \right) \end{aligned}$$

for $1/2 + c/\log t \leq \sigma \leq \sigma_1$. Thus, we prove Corollary 2. □

3 Proof of Theorem 2

We let $T > 2$ and $\sigma = 1/2 + a/\log T$ for a small a . We set

$$a_n = \frac{\gamma_n + \gamma_{n-1}}{2}.$$

Theorem 4 implies that under the assumption of Theorem 2, we obtain that for $s = \sigma + it$ and $n = 2, 3, \dots$,

$$\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) = \frac{1}{s - \rho_n} + O(\log t) \tag{3.1}$$

for $0 \leq \sigma - 1/2 < 1/\log \gamma_n$ and $a_n < t \leq a_{n+1}$. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \int_1^T \left| \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(\sigma + it) \right|^2 dt &= \sum_{2 \leq n \leq n_1} \int_{a_n}^{a_{n+1}} \left| \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(\sigma + it) \right|^2 dt + \int_{a_{n_1+1}}^T \left| \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(\sigma + it) \right|^2 dt + O(1) \\ &= I + II + O(1), \end{aligned}$$

where $a_{n_1+1} < T < a_{n_1+2}$. Using (3.1), it is easy to see that

$$II = \int_{a_{n_1+1}}^T \left| \frac{1}{(\sigma - 1/2) + i(t - \gamma_{n_1+1})} + O(\log T) \right|^2 dt = O\left(\frac{\log^2 T}{a}\right) + o(\log^2 T).$$

We insert (3.1) into I and then we get

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \sum_{2 \leq n \leq n_1} \int_{a_n}^{a_{n+1}} \left| \frac{1}{(\sigma - 1/2) + i(t - \gamma_n)} + O(\log T) \right|^2 dt \\ &= 2 \sum_{1 < \gamma_n < T} \frac{1}{\sigma - 1/2} \tan^{-1} \frac{\gamma_{n+1} - \gamma_n}{2(\sigma - 1/2)} + \\ &\quad O\left(\log T \sum_{1 < \gamma_n < T} \log\left(1 + \frac{\gamma_{n+1} - \gamma_n}{2(\sigma - 1/2)}\right)\right) + O(T \log^2 T). \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Since $\liminf(\gamma_{n+1} - \gamma_n) \log \gamma_n > 0$, there is a $\beta > 0$ such that

$$\frac{\gamma_{n+1} - \gamma_n}{2(\sigma - 1/2)} \geq \frac{\beta}{2a} \quad (3.3)$$

is large as $a \rightarrow 0$. We recall Proposition 2.1(1)

$$\sum_{1 < \gamma_n < T} 1 = \frac{T}{2\pi} \log \frac{T}{2\pi e} + O(\log T). \quad (3.4)$$

Using (3.3), (3.4) and the fact that $\tan^{-1} x = \frac{\pi}{2} + O(1/x)$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\sum_{1 < \gamma_n < T} \tan^{-1} \frac{\gamma_{n+1} - \gamma_n}{2(\sigma - 1/2)} = \frac{1}{4} T \log T - \frac{T}{4} \log(2\pi e) + O(aT \log T) + O(\log T). \quad (3.5)$$

We recall that there exists a $A > 0$ such that

$$\#\{n : 0 < \gamma_n \leq T, \gamma_{n+1} - \gamma_n \geq \frac{\lambda}{\log T}\} = O\left(T \log T e^{-A\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}(\log \lambda)^{-\frac{1}{4}}}\right), \quad (3.6)$$

uniformly for $\lambda \geq 2$. For this we refer to [6] and [14, p. 246]. Using (3.4) and (3.6), we can see that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 < \gamma_n < T} \log\left(1 + \frac{\gamma_{n+1} - \gamma_n}{2(\sigma - 1/2)}\right) &= O\left(T \log T \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \log\left(1 + \frac{m}{2a}\right) e^{-Am^{\frac{1}{2}}(\log m)^{-\frac{1}{4}}}\right) \\ &= O\left(T \log T \log \frac{1}{a}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

We insert (3.5) and (3.7) into (3.2) and then we obtain

$$I = \frac{1}{2a} T \log^2 T - \frac{\log(2\pi e)}{2a} T \log T + O\left(\log \frac{1}{a} (T \log^2 T)\right) + O(\log^2 T/a).$$

Using I and II , we can get

$$\int_1^T \left| \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(\sigma + it) \right|^2 dt = \frac{1}{2a} T \log^2 T \left(1 - \frac{\log(2\pi e)}{\log T} + O\left(a \log \frac{1}{a}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right) \right).$$

Hence Theorem 2 follows.

4 Acknowledgment

I truly thank Professor C. Y. Yildirim for his many valuable comments and suggestions on this paper.

References

- [1] B. C. Berndt, *The number of zeros for $\zeta^{(k)}(s)$* , J. London Math. Soc.(2) **2** (1970), 577–580
- [2] J. B. Conway, *Functions of one complex variable*, 2nd ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics **11**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1978
- [3] H. Davenport, *Multiplicative Number Theory*, 3rd ed., revised by H.L. Montgomery, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **74**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000
- [4] D. W. Farmer, S. M. Gonek and C. P. Hughes, *The maximal size of L -functions*, J. Reine Angew. Math., to appear
- [5] S. Feng, *A note on the zeros of the derivative of the Riemann zeta function near the critical line*, Acta Arith. **120.1** (2005), 59–68
- [6] A. Fujii, *On the distribution of the zeros of the Riemann zeta function in short intervals*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **81** (1975), 139–142
- [7] D. A. Goldston, S. M. Gonek and H. L. Montgomery, *Mean values of the logarithmic derivative of the Riemann zeta-function with applications to primes in short intervals*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **537** (2001), 105–126
- [8] N. Levinson and H. L. Montgomery, *Zeros of the derivatives of the Riemann zeta-function*, Acta Math. **133** (1974), 49–65

- [9] H. L. Montgomery, “*The pair correlation of zeros of the zeta function*” in *Analytic Number Theory*(St. Louis, Mo., 1972), Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **24**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence 1973, 181–193
- [10] ———, *Extreme values of the Riemann zeta-function*, Comment. Math. Helv. **52** (1977), 511–518
- [11] A. Selberg, *On the remainder in the formula for $N(T)$, the number of zeros of $\zeta(s)$ in the strip $0 < t < T$* , Avh. Norske Vid. Akad. Oslo. I. **1** (1944), 1–27
- [12] K. Soundararajan, *The horizontal distribution of zeros of $\zeta'(s)$* , Duke Math. J. **91** (1998), 33–59
- [13] A. Speiser, *Geometrisches zur Riemannschen Zetafunktion*, Math. Ann. **110** (1934), 514–521
- [14] E. C. Titchmarsh, *The Theory of the Riemann Zeta-function*, 2nd ed., revised by D. R. Heath-Brown, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1986
- [15] Y. Zhang, *On the zeros of $\zeta'(s)$ near the critical line*, Duke Math. J. **110** (2001), 555–572